

**Department of Health and Human Services  
National Institute of Environmental Health Sciences  
National Cancer Institute**

**Minutes of the Research Process Subcommittee of the Interagency Breast Cancer and  
Environmental Research Coordinating Committee**

**August 16, 2011**

The Research Process Subcommittee of the Interagency Breast Cancer and Environmental Research Coordinating Committee was convened for a meeting on August 16, 2011 at 1:00 p.m. via webinar. The Chair of the subcommittee is Michael Gould, PhD of the University of Wisconsin.

**Subcommittee Members Present**

Sally Darney, PhD  
Michael Gould, PhD  
Kenneth Portier, PhD  
Gayle Vaday, PhD  
Cheryl Walker, PhD

**NIH Staff Present**

Jennifer Collins, MR

**I. Background**

The Interagency Breast Cancer and Environmental Research Coordinating Committee (IBCERCC) is a congressionally mandated body established by the National Institute of Environmental Health Sciences (NIEHS), in collaboration with the National Cancer Institute (NCI). This Committee is comprised of 19 voting members, including representatives of Federal agencies; non-federal scientists, physicians, and other health professionals from clinical, basic, and public health sciences; and advocates for individuals with breast cancer.

The Committee's primary mission is to facilitate the efficient and effective exchange of information on breast cancer research activities among the member agencies, and to advise the NIH and other Federal agencies in the solicitation of proposals for collaborative, multidisciplinary research, including proposals to further evaluate environmental and genomic factors that may be related to the etiology of breast cancer. The Committee serves as a forum and assists in increasing public understanding of the member agencies' activities, programs, policies, and research, and in bringing important matters of interest forward for discussion.

The objectives of the Research Process (RP) Subcommittee of the IBCERCC are integrated and dependent on the objectives and activities of the other Subcommittees of the IBCERCC and include the following: to set research priorities (based on work of the State-of-the-Science Subcommittee), to decrease redundancies across federal and non-governmental organizations, to develop a process for soliciting research, to foster collaborations (based on the work of the Research Translation, Dissemination, and Policy Implications Subcommittee), to highlight peer review issues, and to identify most appropriate models for agencies to work together.

The IBCERCC RP Subcommittee held its seventh meeting, hosted by NIEHS and the NCI, via webinar on August 16, 2011 beginning at 1:00 p.m. Attendees of the meeting included Subcommittee members and NIH staff. The meeting agenda included progress updates on the funding models, portfolio analysis, and recommendations chapters.

## **II. Discussion**

Michael welcomed everyone to the call. The agenda for the call was as follows:

- Welcome and Review of Meeting Report: May 12-13
- Progress Updates
  - Chapter 1: Research Models
  - Chapter 2: Research Portfolio
  - Chapter 3: Recommendations
- Next Steps/Resources Needed/Work Assignments
- Adjourn

Jenny informed everyone that the meeting report from the May meeting has been written and approved by Michele Forman. There are areas that need editing to reflect the discussions for this group. Jenny will circulate the document to the group for their review after she incorporated edits.

### **Chapter 1 Progress Update:**

Ken reported that this section has not been updated to any extent since the last meeting. The last draft is dated 06/28/11. The group spent some time discussing whether Chapters 1 and 2 belonged together or were distinct. Ken sees that Chapter 1 is very descriptive regarding the types of programs. Chapter 2 is really meant to show spending. The group noted that in the first draft of Chapter 2, there are sections regarding models that need to be moved into Chapter 1. Gayle wondered if Chapter 1 is supposed to be a run down of what is currently using or are we narrowing down to those that are worthy of consideration what the recommendations that this committee comes to or is meant to be a catalog of funding that the agencies are using to conduct environmental research. Michael thought that this was really intended to simply provide a review of the models used. The next Chapter would then examine what is currently funded by the government. Michael asked Jenny and Gayle to move the appropriate sections from Chapter 2 to Chapter 1 and then send the most current version back to the group for their review and comment.

### **Chapter 2 Progress Update:**

Gayle and NIH staff distributed their current draft of this chapter to the subcommittee in advance of the conference call. As described above, the group decided that some of the material in the draft actually fits better in Chapter 1. Michael requested that the figures showing the distribution of CSOs for the ICs also have a bar for NIH as a whole. Thus far, nothing has been written with regard to the Committee's assessment of funding in breast cancer and environmental research. Gayle reported that she and the NIH staff have identified environmental research based on CSO and key terms but she wondered about the best way to present this. She said that they are currently just showing the percentage of research in the area. Ken suggested conducting text mining of all of the etiology and prevention grants. He said that he would be able to do this for the group. He requested that Jenny and Gayle send him the project IDs, titles, and abstracts in a tab delimited file.

Jenny also shared a table the State-of-the-Science group has generated to present research needs. She showed it during the webinar and explained it to the members. Ken wondered how the Committee will

back up the perceived gaps. Jenny explained that she thought that this table summarized the research needs found during the literature review.

### **Chapter 3 Progress Update:**

Ken, Michael, and Cheryl spent time updating the group on the progress that they have made on Chapter 3 since the last meeting. In addition to drafting some of the text for the chapter, Ken has drafted a schematic to try and illustrate the research framework. The group spent time discussing the current draft of the figure. Ken explained that it wasn't meant to be completely inclusive, but would be used as an example in the report.

Michael thought that the information found in the table generated by the SOS could be superimposed on the framework. He also thought that coding would be useful for each node. Jenny said that she recalled that Michael had previously suggested that the nodes would be three dimensional, detailing evaluation metrics, classification number, and another side covering additional properties. Cheryl suggested that the dimension of time could be added as well.

Ken reminded the group that this would be recommended as a major project, possibly for the National Academy to cover. It will simply be presented as an example with enough detail to illustrate the recommendation from this group.

Gayle noted that less than 10% of DOD is in environmental research. It is unlikely that DOD will get more, but they may be a few more grants each year that could specifically address the gaps in this area (identified due to the framework).

While she completely supports the idea of the framework, in her writing of some of Chapter 3, Cheryl plans to segue towards innovation pointing out that we need to think outside of the boxes presented in the framework.

Cheryl asked the group if there were other perceived grand challenges beyond exposure assessment, mixtures, and systems biology, and the dissemination of research findings to the public. She will integrate the information that the SOS Subcommittee has been developing regarding research needs into her writing for this section.

Michael asked Jenny to consolidate all of the chapter drafts into one document with the most current versions of everything and then distribute to the group. She will use the outline that Ken generated ahead of the call for all three chapters to generate the first draft.

### **III. Action Items**

- Jenny will circulate the May 12-13 meeting report for review and editing.
- Jenny and Gayle will move sections related to funding models from Chapter 2 to Chapter 1.
- Jenny will add a bar for CSO funding categories for NIH as a whole the graph in Chapter 2.
- Jenny and Gayle will send Ken the project numbers, abstracts, and titles for etiology and prevention related grants for text mining.
- Ken will conduct text mining on the grades in the etiology and prevention CSO categories.
- Ken and Michael will continue developing Chapter 3.
- Cheryl will incorporate the table generated by the SOS Subcommittee regarding research needs into her topic of grand challenges.

- Jenny will generate the first draft of a document that will pull together all of the different materials that have been developed for the individual chapters. She will circulate to the group by 08/26.

#### **IV. Adjournment**

The meeting was adjourned at 2:30 p.m. on August 16, 2011.

#### **CERTIFICATION**

I hereby certify that, to the best of my knowledge, the foregoing minutes and attachments are accurate and complete.

/Michael Gould/

Michael Gould, PhD

Chairperson

Research Process Subcommittee

Interagency Breast Cancer & Environmental Research Coordinating Committee

/Gwen W. Collman/

Gwen W. Collman, PhD

Executive Secretary

Research Process Subcommittee

Interagency Breast Cancer & Environmental Research Coordinating Committee

Proper signatures

Treat as signed, § 1.4(d)(2)